sponsible for this exhibit and order them to award a contract forthwith to private industry to rearrange completely the Federal building with daring and imagination so that the millions of people who will visit the fair in these next 2 years will be able to leave as proud Americans, proud of their Federal Government.

I have in my district a private concern, Independence Hall of Chicago, whose president, Mr. S. L. de Love, has done a magnificent job in helping arrange an inspiring exhibit at the Illinois Pavilion, which is just across the street from the Federal Building at the World's Fair.

I am sure that the people at Independence Hall would gladly loan the many available documents which they have dealing with the glory of American history and America's strength to help improve the Federal exhibit.

I am sure that there are many other private companies capable of taking this Federal exhibit and reorganizing it completely so that it will inspire instead of deject.

I can assure my colleagues that the most disappointing exhibit at the World's Fair is the Federal Building.

I do not believe it is too late because the big crowds are yet to come, both this year and all of next year.

I urge this action because the rest of the New York World's Fair is so tremendously inspiring that the dismal contrast of our own exhibit leaves one somewhat bewildered.

We need only contrast the lackluster Federal Building to the truly inspiring exhibit arranged by the State of Illinois with the help of Walt Disney and Mr. De Love's Independence Hall of Chicago. The Illinois Pavilion has a life-size model of our immortal President, Abraham Lincoln, delivering a message so completely inspiring that every single American who leaves the Illinois exhibit leaves with a rebirth of faith, courage, understanding, dedication, and devotion to the United States.

Why could not the Federal bureaucracy have used similar imagination in arranging the U.S. Government's exhibit?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues who visited the Federal exhibit will agree that major surgery is necessary if this exhibit is to attain the high standards of inspiration so eloquently feasible throughout the New York World's Fair.

I sincerely hope President Johnson will order such surgery without delay.

Present Immigration Quota System Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, presented on Thursday, June 11, 1964, on my bill, H.R. 7700, to revise our immigration laws. My statement and section-by-section analysis of my bill follow:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

Mr. FEIGHAN, my distinguished colleagues, I welcome, indeed, the opportunity to talk on our immigration policy generally and my bill, H.R. 7700, specifically.

As you know, H.R. 7700 embodies a proposal submitted to the Congress in a special message by the late President Kennedy and formally supported by President Johnson.

The present law perpetuates the principle of national origins, an antiquated immigration system proven beyond peradventure of a doubt to be unworkable. It was devised in 1921—more than 40 years ago, in an atmosphere of fear bordering on hysteria—a direct result of the unsettled domestic and foreign conditions following World War I. H.R. 7700 erases it.

One of the very first speeches that I ever made in Congress inveighed against the national origins theory which was embedded in the 1921 law and was further extended in the 1924 act. At no time was this formula actually workable, constituting, as it did, a gratuitous insult to many nations whose friendship we forfeited.

The fundamental feature of my bill, H.R. 7700, is the elimination from our laws of the fallacious belief that the place of birth or the racial origin of a human being determines the quality or the level of a man's intellect, or his moral character or his suitability for assimilation into our Nation and our society.

In searching for a brief and comprehensive description of the underlying principle of my bill I use these words: "We do not intend to ask any immigrant, 'Where were you born?' We intend to ask him only 'Who are you and what can you do for the country in which you have chosen to live?' "

Since the enactment of the law which enunciated the contrived ideology of the national origins theory, the criticism has been both acute and unceasing. Historians, social philosophers, demographers have pointed again and again to the fallacious reasoning which led to the adoption of the national origins formula.

Forty years of testing have proven that the rigid pattern of discrimination has not only produced imbalances, but that Congress itself, through a long series of enactments forced by the realities of a changing world saw fit to modify this unworkable formula so that today it remains on the books primarily as an expression of gratuitous condescension. In fact, the condemned formula applies now to only 33 percent of our total annual immigration and even with regard to that 33 percent it is splintered time and time again by legislative patchwork attempting to prop up a crumbling structure.

I am firmly convinced that this formula would have been changed years ago had a workable substitute been found. I am offering that formula now in the bill H.R. 7700.

It is no secret to you, nor for that matter to anyone in Congress, that I have been highly vocal in decrying the national origins system of immigration selection. I have sponsored some and followed closely each successive act of Congress which fractured the untenable ratio of selectivity that allots annually some 65,000 quota numbers to Great Britain and some 300 to Greece and 250 to Spain.

Congress recognized well what it was doing when it adopted these one-shot acts. This committee is well aware of how the Congress shattered the national origin pattern, but whatever the reason, we chose not to call a spade a spade. In other words, we never did admit to the truth of what we were doing. In a sense, each of the acts of Congress I am about to enumerate has been an act of redemption, the slow retreat from the fears and failures of 1921 and 1924, and an open recognition of the unworkability of the basic principle of our immigration law.

As soon as Nazi Germany's surrender silenced the guns of World War II, the free world awoke to face the overwhelming task of resettling over 1.5 million victims of Nazi and Communist terror, the liberated inmates of concentration camps and Hitler's slave laborers; in short, the mass of humanity stamped "Displaced Persons." The United States decided to offer hospitality to what was deemed to be her fair share of the unfortunates. However, the national origins formula of the 1924 law remained an unsurmountable obstacle to what the people of the United States wanted to do; namely, to accept the responsibility which the U.S. position of leadership in the world had imposed.

In 1948, the 80th Congress passed the first Displayed Persons Act. Woefuly inadequate as that law was, it permitted the entry of 200,000 displaced persons outside of the national origins quota limitation, but in spite of the objections of many, myself included, that law imposed an unfair mortgage of the immigration quotas.

The 81st Congress passed the second Displaced Persons Act, sponsored by myself. Once again, the Congress recognized that the national origins quota system must be disregarded if this country were to respond to the public demand and discharge its moral and humanitarian obligations. As a compromise, the unfortunate mortgage feature of the 1948 law was retained.

In 1957, however, under a bill sponsored in the Senate by the late President Kennedy and in the House by my late friend and colleague, Mr. Walter, the mortgage provision was stricken from the statute books in obvious recognition of the fact that the situation created by the simultaneous operation of the national origin system plus the mortgage, had become untenable. Congress knew that the doors to the United States could no longer stay tightly shut for immigrants born in some 11 countries of eastern Europe which suffered most under Hitler's and Stalin's rule.

The ink was hardly dry on the basic act of 1952 when, early in 1953, the Congress recognized that while the displaced persons and refugees resettlement problems have not yet been solved, the new law, by carrying forward the national origins formula, left this country without any instrumentality to cope with its responsibilities and the emergent needs of the homeless. A new refugee admission law was proposed and quickly passed. It is known as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. It brought to these shores over 220,000 refugees outside of the quota system, outside of the national origins formula and even without the pitiful expediency of the mortgage used in the 1948 and the 1950 enactments.

Just as the two Displaced Persons Acts constituted the first loud and public admission of the obsolescence and the unworkability of the national origins formula of the 1924 law, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, enacted only 8 months after the 1952 act became effective, remains an equally convincing piece of evidence of the bankruptcy of the system so very unfortunately incorporated in the statute now in effect.

Since 1957 every Congress, through the 87th, has been called upon to pass and did, indeed, pass a law further bending, chipping off, and whittling away the national origins formula.

Under pressure of inescapable facts, the 85th Congress passed the act of September

11, 1957, converting into nonquota status many thousands of immigrants in the first, second, and third preferences, the highly skilled aliens whose services were urgently needed in this country and the relatives of U.S. citizens and immigrants. Under the same law all unused numbers remaining from the Refugee Relief Act allocations were authorized to be used—again without regard to national origin of the applicants.

The Hungarian emergency caught the United States again unprepared to cope with the crying and most urgent need for offering asylum to the victims of Soviet terror. A broad interpretation of the law was used and the doors were open but the Congress had to act fast to redress the situation and the same 85th Congress enacted on August 8, 1958, the law authored by Mr. FEIGHAN granting permanent residence to upward of 40,000 Hungarian refugees. The principle of national origins received another body blow.

From 1957 on, this trend of congressional action in the field of immigration became obvious—and permanent. Every year, through 1962, brought new laws admitting outside of the national origin system highly skilled specialists, relatives of U.S. citizens and permanently residing aliens as well as refugees; always, however, on a piecemeal basis, never reaching the core of the problem.

In 1958, the Congress passed four such laws, the acts of July 25, August 8, August 21, and September 2. The last one—Public Law 85-892—had an additional significance since it selected nationals of only two countries for relief, the Portuguese victims of the earthquake which took place on the Azores and the Dutch expelled from Indonesia—a truly convincing admission of the inadequacy of the national origins quota system, as the quota for the Netherlands is relatively large, while the Portuguese quota is very small—both equally inadequate to achieve congressional intent to help.

The 86th Congress acted twice along the same lines. The act of September 22, 1959, granted nonquota status to relatives of United States citizens and permanent residents who had already experienced a waiting period on the consular registers exceeding 10 to 15 years. The act of July 14, 1960, admitted more Portuguese and more Dutchmen as well as authorized the paroling of refugees with the built-in provision permitting the Attorney General to adjust their status to that of permanent residence after they had spent 2 years in the United States. National origin was again totally disregarded.

The 87th Congress did not deviate from this now almost traditional course of action. Again, under the act of September 26, 1961, the reuniting of immigrant families was expedited by exempting large numbers of registrants from the national origin restrictions. Following that, under the act of October 24, 1962, the Congress enlarged on the categories of relatives permitted to enter on a nonquota basis and for the fourth time since 1957 has extricated first preference applicants, the skilled specialists, from the national origins straitjacket.

Thus, year after year the Congress continued to tear away bits and pieces of the national origins system until a situation was created where that system, as of fiscal year 1963, governs the admission of only 33 percent of our total immigration intake while the onus of it remains nailed down to our entire immigration code.

In view of this history can we honestly say that we are now faced with a radical proposal? Are we really suddenly and dramatically departing from that which we presumably had held sacred for 40 years? Obviously, no. Instead of clean surgery we have indulged ourselves in operations of occasional blood infusion into a moribund system.

And you, gentlemen, know best how much time, effort, blood, and sweat you, yourself, put into the patchwork repair job of our immigration laws when you sit each week and examine thousands of private bills, never reaching the bottom of the barrel.

In H.R. 7700 careful provision is made for proper transition from the medieval formula into modern times. For 5 years each quota allotment will be reduced 20 percent until at the end of that period there will be no national allotments. The unallotted numbers will be placed into a general pool and issued in chronological order within statutorily defined preferences favoring highly skilled specialists and uniting of families. Special provisions are made for emergency situations, thus eliminating the need for emergency legislation which we have been called upon to pass over the years.

At this point I want to make it clear, since every discussion surrounding immigration changes is obscured by arguments about our unemployment, our lack of classrooms, our housing, etc., that these arguments are totally irrelevant since the bill before you in no way significantly increases the basic numbers of immigrants to be permitted entry. We are not talking about increased immigration; we are talking about equality of opportunity for all peoples to reach this promised land. We freely acknowledge the fact that we are a land of immigrants, that this amalgam of blood has given us the richness, the diversity, the creativity that no other country in history has been able to achieve. From the builder of tunnels to the atomic scientist, we have drawn from the pool of world talent and have created a pluralistic society which—and I do not exaggerate—remains the wonder of all living historians.

In this complex age, therefore, shall not we as a Nation have the means whereby we can choose freely from all corners of the earth the talents and the skills we need and not limit our own choice because one man of genius was born 5 miles east or south of an arbitrarily traced boundary. This is the prime merit of this proposal, the flexibility, the acknowledgement that talent does not repose in only a few chosen spots of land areas.

It is now 40 years, almost to the day, since the 1924 national origins law was enacted. I submit that the fears and phobias of four decades ago have no place in our society in 1964. I respectfully submit that the days of patching are behind us. Is it not time our surgery were direct, clean, and straightforward?

Now I shall give you section-by-section analysis of my bill, H.R. 7700.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 7700

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve established in section 2. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,800) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool has 40 percent of present quotas (or 65,600); until in the fifth year, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 establishes the quota reserve pool under which all numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quotas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

These numbers are issued in the order specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training, or education, would be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued to the skilled specialists, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two classes, is given to spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other applicants, with percentage preferences to other relations of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by section 1. Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with specific problems. Since some countries' quotas are now current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. Such a result would be undesirable not only because it frustrates the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries so affected are our closest allies.

At a time when the national security rests in large part on a continual strengthening of our ties with these countries, it would be anomalous indeed to restrict opportunities for their nationals here. Therefore, the bill allows the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by sec. 16), to reserve up to 50 percent of the reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the present system but not under the new bill, whose admission (2) would further the national security interest in maintaining close ties with their countries. He is also given authority to grant visas to such immigrants without regard to the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country.

The President may also disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They have had no thought of immigration before being forced to leave their usual homes by natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be fleeing from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous. He may consider these and other factors in deciding whether to admit any applicant as a refugee or require him to await his turn under the regular procedure.

Finally, it is provided that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but does not then find them needed for the named purposes, they are to be issued as if not reserved.

Similarly, the 10-percent limitations on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is removed where other persons would not be foreclosed from entry by its removal.

Section 3 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total issued each year. This limit is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from that preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all numbers are nevertheless issued, present law provides that numbers not issued during the first 10 months may be issued during the last 2 months of the fiscal year, without limitation up to the total annual quota for the quota area. Often, if close to the full 10 percent is not issued in each of the first months, undesirable administrative problems result in the last two. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. It thus allows more even spacing of visas issuance during the year.

Section 4 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called "Asia-Pacific Triangle" provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. By the end of 5 years, this provision would be superfluous in any case, since national origin will no longer limit the admission of qualified immigrants. But the formula is so specially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) raises the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent countries, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent countries' allotments are taken from the mother countries' quotas. To prevent the dependent countries from preempting the mother countries' quotas disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent countries' shares of the quotas will decrease as the governing countries' quotas are reduced.

Subsection (e) conforms the present section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to the change in designation prescribed in subsection (c).

Section 5 repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus in Germany alone, under present law, over 7,000 visas are taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more visas are issued to persons who do not apply for actual admission. All these visas are lost. Such a result is inconsistent with the new bill, which seeks full use of authorized quota numbers.

Substituted for section 207 is a specific command that nonquota immigrants shall not preempt visas which would otherwise be issued to quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 7 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend nonquota status to all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of all Caribbean island countries independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends the status to countries gaining their independence since then.

Section 8 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if their services are "needed urgently" in the United States. The amendment allows their admission if their services would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by section 6.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, if an immigrant does not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category, he is not preferred to any other immigrant even though he may answer a definite need in the United States which the other immigrant does not. The amendment allows to persons filling such a definite need a preference of 50 percent of visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 9 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) provide for the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers granted preference by section 8, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers with lesser skills.

Paragraph (2) also exempts skilled specialists from the present petition procedure, to conform to the new procedure established in paragraph (4). Under present law, persons with high education, technical training, experience, or ability, may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract the educated, trained people whose services would significantly enhance our economy, national life, and general welfare. Thousands of such people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to get the necessary job. Even if they knew whom to contact, few jobs important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews. And only a few very large enterprises and institutions have representatives abroad with possible authority to hire. Thus many highly skilled applicants cannot obtain the jobs presently required for preference; they cannot be hired abroad, because hiring is done domestically; and they cannot be hired domestically until they enter.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment, as to these persons, is unnecessary. Such a requirement may serve two ends. First, it may help to insure that the immigrant, granted preference for a defined purpose, will fulfill that purpose; if we need engineers, he should work as one.

Highly skilled specialists, however, will always work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed, therefore, is that the Attorney General ascertain from the Board (which has consulted the Secretary of Labor and studied such problems with specific reference to immigrants) that job openings exist in the immigrants' special field. The second end the present petition procedure may serve is confirmation of the applicant's own evidence of his training, education, or skills; presumably he would not be employed unless qualified. But such confirmation is superfluous if proper controls are enforced when the visa is applied for. And since we allow immigrants to enter without U.S. citizens vouching for their loyalty—a far more important matter—there seems no reason to require their capability to be thus additionally supported.

Paragraph (4), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant preferred status to highly skilled immigrants upon affadavit of the immigrants, supported by such other documentary evidence as he shall prescribe.

Section 10 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish the right to preferred status as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive changes made by section 8.

Section 11 amends the "Fair Share" refugee law to remove a provision which has hampered its operation. Presently, that law allows the entry only of refugees within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The provision relating to the United Nations mandate is stricken out, so that our refugee law is no longer subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) repeals the "Fair Share" law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; these have all been settled and the authority is now unnecessary.

Section 12 amends the Refugee Relief Act to allow the admission of refugees from North Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions.

The act now admits such refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The amendment substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 13 grants discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances set by section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The discretion granted will allow him to control two undesirable situations.

One, many people in countries with oversubscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of immigrating; they regard the registration as "insurance" against a possible future move. These registrations make planning difficult and encumber administration. The amendment would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit part of the $5 visa fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a rule might discourage the most frivolous registrations.

Two, otherwise admissable immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the $20 visa fee. Rather than bar them from entry, the Secretary is given authority to allow postponement of payment until they have earned the money here.

Section 281, is further amended to equalize the visa fees paid by all immigrants; at present, nonquota or preference applicants must pay $10 more than persons not entitled to priority.

Section 14, like section 13, addressed the problem of "insurance" registrations. Many people who applied for visas years ago, and have been offered visas repeatedly, have

turned them down each year. They wish only to preserve their priority against some future event. This addition to section 302(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act would allow the Secretary to terminate the registrations of those who had previously declined a visa. Like section 13, it also is important in connection with a projected reregistration of all applicants in certain oversubscribed quota areas, in which we have no way of knowing whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary would terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister as required. The provision is not made mandatory to avoid embarrassing or endangering registrants in totalitarian countries, who have no desire to approach an embassy before visas are actually available for them.

Section 15 amends subsections (a)(4) and (g) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feeble-minded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. This provision has an unfortunate effect on families seeking admission though one member, often a child, is retarded or feeble-minded. Such families are forced to choose between leaving the child behind, or staying with it; in either case, the child is condemned to facilities for treatment which are often inadequate. The person afflicted may not enter even if the family is willing and able to care for him, nor even if he is one of the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons who can be substantially helped by proper treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children or parents of citizens, resident aliens, or holders of immigrant visas. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on entry, such as the giving of a bond to insure continued family support, as would be appropriate in each case.

The bars to epileptics are removed entirely, since this affliction is now under the control of modern medicine. Those few epileptics whose illness prevents normal functioning will be excludible under the provision barring persons likely to become public charges.

Section 16 establishes the Immigration Board. The Board is composed of seven members. Two are appointed by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, and three, including the chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The Board's duties are to study, and consult with, appropriate Government departments on, all facets of immigration policy; to recommend to the President whether to reserve quota numbers in the national interest under section 2; and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission under the occupational preferences of section 8.

Sections 17 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds insuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

I wish to inform the subcommittee that I do not intend to ask for the enactment of H.R. 3926 and H.R. 6238, as their features are embodied in H.R. 7700.

Service to the Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that many Members arriving and departing from our airports have had occasion to use the services of Airport Transport, Inc., and I was pleased to note that the accomplishments of this unique service organization won attention in a recent issue of the magazine of the Gulf Oil Co.

I think the article will be of interest to many who read the RECORD, and I include it with my remarks, as follows:

It is a sobering fact of the jet age that both the beginning and the end of a journey by air—swift and effortless as it may be—must be by ground transportation. Whether arriving from Karachi, La Paz, or Denver as a diplomat, vacationer, or refugee, the alternatives for getting into town are much the same—board an airport bus, hail a taxi, or wait for Cousin Amy to drive out to meet you.

With airports being built farther and farther from urban centers, to minimize the problem of noise and to allow for more and longer runways, ground transportation becomes ever more important, and also makes a firm and lasting impression on all who must travel or choose to travel by air.

To those who land at Washington National, and Dulles International Airport in Chantilly, Va., 27 miles from downtown Washington, the big air-conditioned buses and limousines waiting at the entrances to take on passengers and their baggage are a welcome sight. For it is very likely that Cousin Amy may have taken a wrong turn on the way out, or misread your telegram.

The deluxe bus and limousine service at Washington's two big airports, a long and pleasant step from the early days of the jitneys and errant cabs, is provided by Airport Transport, Inc., an organization that began scheduled operation in 1941 with 18 employees and 12 cars. The company takes pride in having grown with the airline industry and having kept abreast of the jet age. There are now 450 employees and more than 200 vehicles—buses, limousines, taxis, and chauffeured limousines for special business or diplomatic assignments.

The man largely responsible for this steady growth in the company, and for bringing its service to a high level of efficiency and comfort is Moe Lerner, president and general manager of Airport Transport, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Airport Transport was not always so progressive nor operated as efficiently. In 1946, 5 years after being organized at the time of the opening of Washington National Airport, the young company ran into operational as well as financial difficulties. It remained for Moe Lerner, then 37, with 18 years of transportation experience in New York behind him, to take over the company and put it on a sound financial basis.

Since taking over the organization, Mr. Lerner has succeeded in making ground transportation not just a good cartage service but an important, first-class adjunct to air travel. Several citations from 13 airlines flying in and out of Washington and Dulles attest to the facts of exemplary dedication and service to the airlines' on-the-ground customers.

Passengers originating from Washington and suburbs boarding buses at the Airlines Terminal Building, 12th and K Streets, downtown, and other pickup points may check their luggage through to their destinations without charge. Airport Transport also guarantees that they will get their passengers to their flights on time and does so for more than 1,600,000 travelers a year while operating its vehicles approximately 8 million miles.

One of the prime requisites of a good transportation system is that units be on time, ready, and waiting where they are needed. To this end Airport Transport has developed a highly efficient scheduling and dispatching system. Radio dispatchers at Washington National Airport and the downtown Terminal Building are in radio contact with all units and can, by anticipating peak load periods or special situations, direct limousines, cabs, and buses to locations where they are required.

The company, to keep its rolling stock rolling, to avoid breakdowns and consequent delays, adheres to a program of preventive maintenance and uses Gulf petroleum products exclusively. Airport Transport has been a Gulf customer for almost 22 years and is the second largest account in the Washington area in purchases of Gulf gasoline, lubricating oil, and diesel fuel.

Of special pride to the spare, well-tailored president is the company's Dulles Airport operation. When Airport Transport won the contract to service the jet port, it purchased 20 big, 40-passenger diesel buses to add to its fleet—an investment of close to $1 million.

Dulles International Airport, one of the world's most beautiful and certainly the most revolutionary in concept, was designed by the late Eero Saarenin and built by the Federal Aviation Authority.

Dulles, opened for jet passenger aircraft in late 1962, was the first airport in the country to change radically the traditional pattern of air passenger handling. At the mammoth glass and concrete pavilion, passengers do not have to walk from one end to the other, and then out through long concourses to get to the planes. Air travelers arriving at Dulles by car or bus are put off at the airport entrance opposite their airline's gate. They walk only a short distance to a "mobile lounge" and there enter a de luxe "living room on wheels." When the flight is announced, the mobile lounge is driven away under its own power to the boarding plane, a quarter of a mile or so out on the field. And, like a whale calf nosing into its mother, the strange-looking carriage gently attaches itself to the plane. The passengers then transfer to their seats in the aircraft.

Travelers arriving by jet at Dulles International are met by the mobile lounge, and transported across the field to the airport building. Leaving the lounge, passengers need walk only across the width of the main concourse to the waiting Airport Transport limousines, buses, and taxis.

The man in charge of this newest operation is Robert Lerner, 25, oldest son of the company president. Young Bob Lerner has been in the transportation business, himself, for several years since completing school.

For months before Dulles opened to civilian air traffic, Bob worked with the downtown office and the airlines, helping perfect arrangements and schedules for the handling of Dulles air travelers. The result of this planning is that each incoming flight is met by several large units of the Lerner fleet, and a number of taxis for local passengers.

Moe Lerner, whose story of business success and work in the community was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1959, is proud of his company's part in the jet age picture. He comments with a smile, "From our air-conditioned coaches to the luxury of an international jet is but a few short steps. And the difference in mode of transportation,